



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

brought up at the Paris Conference were viewed in the old familiar light of national interests. "Promises to liberate Arabs, Syrians, Armenians, and Greeks, were war manoeuvres and not intended seriously. Not President Wilson's 'fourteen points' and subsequent discourses, as had been promised at the time of the armistice, but the Anglo-Franco-Russo-Italian treaty of April 26, 1915; the Anglo-French Sykes-Picot agreement of 1916; the Anglo-French promises to Italy at Saint Jean-de-Maurienne in 1916; the Anglo-Hedjaz treaty of 1917; and the Franco-Russian convention of February, 1917, were the bases of the Ottoman settlement in the minds of the Entente delegates and members of commissions." Diplomacy, in short, appears to be the same old game!

Besides formulating the challenge to European eminent domain that is coming from many different quarters to-day with increasing force—formulating it and putting the facts behind it,—and besides showing the persistence of that policy at the Conference, Dr. Gibbons discusses with what appears to be full knowledge certain related subjects that are of especial importance just now. The chapter on Zionism points out in a practically conclusive manner the absurdity and injustice of the plan to set up a Jewish state in the already populated territory of Palestine. Of great interest, too, is the author's opinion that "if America accepted a mandate for only one of the liberated races, our conception of administering the mandate would inevitably and immediately bring us into conflict with the other mandates"; while the only way to prevent Entente Powers from quarreling with one another over Near Eastern questions is for the United States to take over the future of all the Ottoman races.

But most of all, three ideas are impressed upon the reader of Dr. Gibbons's book. First, imperialism can no longer be dressed up as altruism. Secondly, selfish national aims are still the determining factors in European policies: altruism, at best, plays second fiddle. Thirdly—and this is a point on which the author's intimate knowledge of the East enables him to speak with authority—adherence to the doctrine of European eminent domain in Asia will inevitably lead to wars; not only because the European nations will have difficulty, as in the past, in adjusting their mutual differences, but because the Asiatic peoples, who have a far greater reserve power of knowledge and energy than is generally supposed, are today, more than ever before, determined to maintain their rights.

WITHOUT THE WALLS. By Katrina Trask. New York: the Macmillan Company.

There is nothing at all remarkable about the fable of Mrs. Trask's new play, which relates very simply the love story of a Jewish maiden and a Roman soldier at the time of the Crucifixion. Alceda, a Hebrew girl, all tenderness and purity and Hebrew intensity of emotion; Jahdiel, her father, a Pharisee peculiarly hypocritical and intolerant; Tiberius, a Roman of good family, chivalrous, high-minded, and determined; a faithful, garrulous old nurse, a sprightly, impudent serving boy;—these and some others give occasion for sympathy and for a clash of wills. Alceda's mother has been stoned to death in accordance with the stern Jewish law, and her daughter is accordingly deemed to be in disgrace. Fearing that no respectable Hebrew will marry her, Jahdiel provisionally promises

Alceda to the young Roman whom she loves; but when her beauty tempts the sensual Josephus, Jahdiel changes his mind and treats the girl cruelly in an effort to force her into a union which she loathes. The dawning of a new order, while it gives the lovers a vision of spiritual freedom, rids them also of persecution; and the dagger wherewith Jahdiel would have murdered his daughter drops from his hand when he hears that the veil of the Temple is rent in twain.

The play has one distinctive quality—its eloquent expression of the sentiment of goodness. Goodness in its simple forms—purity, honesty, good will—is beautiful, like light and air. Thus the better characters of the play have something of supernal charm and natural dignity about them—like the good people in *Comus*—though unfortunately they talk more often in a manner rather conventionally dramatic than poetic. The sentiment of goodness ought to be a strong feeling. Doubtless it is so with people who never express it. It is difficult to depict because it has not, like passion, rosy colors. Without preaching in the least, Mrs. Trask makes evident the real attractiveness of simple virtue—which, no more than “divine philosophy” is “harsh and crabbed, as dull fools suppose.” Similarly, without dwelling upon scriptural events or lessons Mrs. Trask has filled her play with the atmosphere—as she conceives it—of Christianity. Christ’s doctrine is rumored and the play is filled with a sense of the sweetness of it.

For the rest the play is far from compelling; it is only in a superficial way dramatic. Here is no insight into the real thoughts, the real feelings of men and women. The virtuous characters are a little too childlike to be taken very seriously; when their child’s game is over, one feels that all, of course, will be well with them. And the evil characters are still less convincing. Jahdiel speaks lines that are cruel enough; but he has not the peculiar characteristics—the stigmata—of a ruthless bigot. Josephus, too, plays a part: one sees him leer, but one is not persuaded that the grimace betokens real sin. It would not be surprising if both these men suddenly turned good; it would be, in either case, but the dropping of a mask.

Perhaps the passage of the play which approaches nearest to literature is that in which various persons—Tiberius, Nicodemus (a ruler in Israel), Antiochus (a Greek philosopher), Marius, a Roman courtier—hear reports of the Crucifixion and speculate about the personality of Jesus. In this there is a feeling of awe and of serenity, and the human reactions are convincing.